

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

JAMAL MARSHALL,

Plaintiff,

v.

WASHOE COUNTY JAIL, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:19-cv-00113-MMD-WGC

ORDER

This action began with a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by Jamal Marshall, a former state prisoner. On March 19, 2021, the Court issued an order directing Marshall to file his updated address by April 16, 2021. (ECF No. 8.) The deadline has now expired, and Marshall has not filed his updated address or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (affirming dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (affirming dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

1 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey  
2 a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors:  
3 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to  
4 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring  
5 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.  
6 See *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at  
7 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

8 Here, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously  
9 resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket, weigh in favor of  
10 dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of  
11 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay  
12 in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air*  
13 *West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—public policy favoring  
14 disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of  
15 dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey  
16 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"  
17 requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d  
18 at 1424. The Court's order requiring Marshall to file his updated address by April 16, 2021,  
19 expressly stated: "IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, if Plaintiff fails to timely comply with  
20 this order, this case will be subject to dismissal without prejudice." (ECF No. 8.) Thus,  
21 Marshall had adequate warning that dismissal would result from his noncompliance with  
22 the Court's order to file his updated address by April 16, 2021.

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on  
2 Marshall's failure to file an updated address in compliance with this Court's March 19,  
3 2021, order.

4 The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

5 DATED THIS 21<sup>st</sup> Day of April 2021.

6  
7 

8 MIRANDA M. DU  
9 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28